[29th January 1929

(*d*) whether it is a fact that officers of the Education department posted to the city are not allowed the city allowance ; and

(*e*) whether the Government will consider their claim for the city allowance with sympathy and observe a uniform policy in the matter of granting the city allowance ?

A.—(*a*) & (*d*) There is no such distinction between departments, but within the Educational department officers of the scholastic and collegiate branches are not given Presidency allowance.

(*b*) The attention of the hon. Member is referred to the list under Class V—Allowance on pages 24—28 of Volume II of the Madras Manual of Special Pay and Allowances.

(*c*) Does not arise.

(*e*) The matter is under the consideration of Government.

11-30 a.m. Mr. Abdul Hamid Khan :—" May I know, if the Director of Public Instruction had already made his proposal and that that proposal was turned down by the Finance Department ? "

The hon. Mr. T. E. Moir :—" The matter is under the consideration of the Government ; I don't understand how any proposal could be turned down before orders are issued."

Mr. Abdul Hamid Khan :—" May I know if that part of the Government which is called the Finance Department is favourably considering that question ? "

The hon. Mr. T. E. Moir :—" The answer is given in clause (*e*), Sir."

Railways

Number of strikers who have resumed works in the South Indian Railway.

* 1139 *Q.*—Mr. S. Satyamurti : Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of railway workers who have joined the workshops of the South Indian Railway since the termination of the last strike ;

(*b*) the number who have not still joined ; and

(*c*) whether the Government propose to take any action in the matter and, if not, why not ?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The information is not available with Government.

(*c*) No. The matter is one concerning the internal administration of the railway and, as the hon. Member is aware, " Railways " is a Central subject.

Arms and ammunition

Suspension of the gun licence to Mr. White.

* 1140 *Q.*—Mr. C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state, with reference to answers to question No. 853 given on 29th November 1928 by the hon. the Law Member—

(*a*) the reasons why Mr. White who was convicted of having caused the death of a man in the Madras Harbour premises by a rifle shot is permitted to possess a rifle under a licence ;

29th January 1929]

(*b*) whether the hon. the Home Member has since passed orders either revoking or suspending the licence; and

(*c*) if not, why not?

A.—(*a*) The Magistrate who tried the case ordered the weapon to be returned to Mr. White. The Commissioner of Police saw no reason to expect that Mr. White will again misuse the weapon. He did not therefore consider it necessary to cancel his licence to possess it.

(*b*) No.

(*c*) The Government did not consider it necessary to interfere.

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA:—"May I know from the hon. the Home Member whether it is open to a man possessing a firearm under licence to shoot down crows or stray coolies within the Corporation limits?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I am not able to understand how that is a supplementary question on the answer given."

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA:—"The licensee must take the previous permission from the Commissioner of Police for shooting anything within the municipal limits In this case, no such licence was taken either for shooting crows or for firing stray shots at passing coolies. Inasmuch as this person has violated this rule, his licence must be cancelled. The supplementary question is this since the licence-holder has violated this rule, why is he still allowed to possess that licence?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Because, on the finding of the Second Presidency Magistrate who tried the case, the Commissioner of Police thought that there was no harm in his possessing the licence."

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA:—"Does the Commissioner think that using this licence and killing Indians is for the safety of the public?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur: "The Commissioner acted upon the order passed by the Magistrate."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO: "May I know whether the Magistrate pronounced any judicial opinion on the subject and ordered the weapon to be returned, or whether he returned it as a matter of course because it was Mr. White's property?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur: "He ordered the weapon to be returned."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO: "May I know whether it is in the absolute discretion of the Magistrate to dispose of this matter as he liked, or whether there are any definite rules guiding him as to when licences should be cancelled?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur: "That question was considered by the Commissioner of Police and he agreed with the Second Presidency Magistrate."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: "Has the Magistrate also ordered the licence to be renewed?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur: "No."

[29th January 1929

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" It is said here : 'The Commissioner of Police saw no reason to expect that Mr. White will again misuse the weapon.' May I know what were the facts on which the Commissioner of Police satisfied himself that Mr. White would not misuse it ?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" The judgment of the Second Presidency Magistrate."

Mr A KALESWARA RAO :—" Do not the Government consider that shooting a man to death is a sufficient cause for suspending or revoking the licence ?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" That is not the question before the House."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know if the judgment contained any reference to the character of Mr. White and whether the judgment said that he would not misuse the weapon ?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" As I have said before, the Second Presidency Magistrate who tried him ordered that the weapon should be returned to him."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" May I know whether the Government called for and perused the records ?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" The Government have perused the records and they do not intend to interfere."

Police

Enquiry into the quadruple murder by Kalidindi Bangar Razu of Pedapulleru.

*1141 Q.—Mr. ABDUL WAHAB SAHIB : With reference to the answer to question 434 answered on 26th August 1925 about the alleged quadruple murder committed on 9th November 1923 by one Kalidindi Bangar Razu of Pedapulleru, Bhimavaram taluk, West Godavari district, will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received the report called for and when;

(b) what does the report disclose ;

(c) what steps were taken by the Government to trace the murderer Kalidindi Bangar Razu ;

(d) what steps were taken by the Government in respect of the movables and outstandings due to the family of Bangar Razu ;

(e) whether it was brought to the notice of the Government that some of the assets due to the murderer are being collected and misappropriated by some of his relatives in spite of the prohibitory order issued by the Government in the year 1925 ; if so, what steps were taken by the Government to preserve the assets intact ;

(f) whether the Government was aware of the fact that no action was taken in respect of the movables of the murderer and that the prohibitory order was only in respect of the debts due to Bangar Razu ;

(g) why a Receiver was not appointed by the Government for the purpose of collecting the outstandings due to the murderer and for preserving them, or, in the alternative, why the interests of the murderer in those outstandings were not sold in public auction ;